

To whom it may concern:

Please consider this another voice calling to reject petition 04-160 brought by the National Association of Broadcasters.

Supply and demand. The invisible hand. Surely these broadcasters have heard these terms before. What boggles the mind is once again the private sector, faced with superior competition, runs to the government to help them ensure their outdated business model continues to work. When you artificially force a condition in the market, who benefits? It's not the taxpaying public, that part should be painfully obvious.

Case in point: I refuse to sit through 30 minutes of drivel, overplayed music, and advertisements on a Clear Channel station to hear 20 seconds worth of traffic information. While I understand the desire of that station to sell advertisement time and stay in business, nothing in the Constitution requires that I support their business model by listening.

Competition fosters innovation. Back when AT&T ran the telephone network, service was good but there were no features. Now because of the competition, you have voicemail, call waiting, caller ID, etc... If the public broadcasters don't like the fact that the satellite service makes their service pale in comparison, they should increase the value and quality of their service instead of having the government artificially set the bar low for them.

The reason the Internet has developed into what it is from the network that DARPA started is due to the 'hands off' approach the U.S. Government took in legislation. In this same vein, allowing satellite radio to continue to answer an obvious market demand would show foresight and wisdom. Again, if the NAB wants the public to choose them over satellite alternatives, they need to make their product better than it currently is.

Please remember that just because you can do a thing doesn't mean you should.

Regards,  
Shane Ballman